



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

TM

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 10/666,042 | 09/22/2003 | Hui-Hua Hsieh | AMI-2611 | 6575 |
| 7590 | 06/27/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| Hui-Hua HSIEH P.O. Box 90 Tainan City, 704 TAIWAN | | | | BARRETT, SUZANNE LALE DINO |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | 3676 |

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/666,042 | HSIEH, HUI-HUA |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Suzanne Dino Barrett | 3676 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in line 3, insert –be—after “block”; line 8, change “the upper” to –an upper--; line 11, after “bolt”, insert –be—. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: throughout the specification, there are several instances of missing articles such as “the” or “a” and other grammatical errors. For instance, page 1, line 9, after “block”, insert –be--; line 10, change “extended” to –extend--; line 11, before “stop”, insert –the--; line 12, “fundamental base” is unclear-why is it fundamental? Furthermore, see similar problems on page 6-8.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 3, “the interior”, line 7, “the inner side” and lines 16-18, “its right end”, “its lower end” and “its upper end” all lack proper antecedent basis as these structures have not been have not been previously positively recited. Note that claims 2-4 are included herein merely because of their dependency.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 17, 'grove" should be changed to --groove--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote 3,422,644 in view of Walz 1,908,582 and Tornoe et al 3,254,516. Foote teaches a padlock comprising an upper base portion (plate groups A and B – 13,14), a lower base portion (plate group C-15), the upper base defining an interior recess 24 for a spring biased stop block 25 having an engaging groove for receiving one end of the spring and the upper base further providing a projecting stud to receive the other end of the spring (Fig. 5), the lower base defining a lock core accommodating chamber and through hole (see Fig. 8), the bases further defining insert holes for a fixed shackle 11 and a movable bolt shackle 11'. The plate groups A,B and C are provided with positioning studs and recesses 16/17,18/19,20/21 to combine the base plates to form the padlock housing. Foote fails to teach a fixing pin for the fixed stationary shackle 11, axial insert holes in the shackle ends, an upper and lower shell combined to house the

padlock and a horizontal projecting stud in the stop block engaging groove for receiving the spring. Walz teaches a fixing pin for a stationary shackle 11 (see Fig.4) , an axial insert hole in the shackle end (at 15 in Fig.4), and a horizontal stud on the stop block 14/17 for receiving the spring end 16. Tornoe et al teach upper and lower shells 32,38 combined by crimping (Fig.9 - col. 2, lines 50-62) to form an outer housing for the padlock body 6, comprising shackle insert holes 34,36 on the upper shell 32 and lock core keyhole aperture 42 on the lower shell. It would have been obvious to modify the padlock structure of Foote by providing the well known features taught by Walz such as the fixing pin, spring receiving stud and shackle axial insert holes in order to provide a more securely constructed padlock and further to provide an outer upper and lower shell as taught by Tornoe et al to further enhance the security of the padlock by preventing tampering with the inner structure.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note the various claimed padlock features shown in the cited prior art, especially, the welded bodies of Kortenbrede and Chen.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzanne Dino Barrett whose telephone number is 571-272-7053. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Glessner can be reached on 571-272-6843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Suzanne Dino Barrett
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3676

sdb